REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the rejections made in the Office Action mailed February 4, 2009 (the "Office Action"). Claims 30, 32, and 33 have been amended. Claims 3-10, 12-13, 16-25, and 30-33 are pending in this application and stand rejected. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments made and the remarks that follow, the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application.

Embodiments of the claimed invention include a wireless communications system incorporating a plurality of synchronized wireless units. Each unit, including its transceiver, minimizes energy requirements by entering an inactive mode between synchronizing signals. A receiver portion of the transceiver can enter an active mode prior to receiving a synchronizing signal. Subsequently and separately, a transmitter portion of the transceiver can enter the active mode to transmit information requested by a received signal.

I. Claims 3-10 and 30-31

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 3-10 and 30-31

A. Claims 3-8 and 30-31

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 3-8 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,230) in view of Lucas (U.S. Patent No. 7,212,512) and further in view of White (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,669). Van Bokhorst teaches a wireless data communication system in which mobile stations are operable in either an awake state or a doze state. Unlike the claimed invention, the

mobile station is only in an awake state in which the transceiver of the mobile station is fully powered or in a doze state in which the transceiver of the mobile station cannot receive or transmit messages. Van Bokhorst does not teach a state in which only a portion of the transceiver is powered. As explained in van Bokhorst,

> "the transceiver 30 of the station 20 is either in an awake state or in a doze state, dependent on the state of the switch 44. In the awake state the transceiver 30 is fully powered and capable of receiving or transmitting messages. In the doze state, the transceiver 30 is operated at a much lower power level and is not capable of receiving or transmitting messages."

van Bokhorst, col 3, ll. 61-67.

Conversely, claim 30 requires that "only a receiver portion of the transceiver" enters the active mode "prior to receipt of subsequent wireless synchronizing signals." Separately and subsequently, "a transmitter portion of the transceiver" enters the active mode to "respond[] to an incoming signal requesting information." Power consumption is further reduced by energizing only the receiver portion of the transceiver prior to the receipt of a synchronization signal and then subsequently energizing the transmitter portion. This is an advantage over systems known to those in the art.

Neither Lucas nor White make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst discussed above. Rather, Lucas teaches a wireless transceiver that performs frequency offset correction, and White teaches a communication protocol in which message packets are prioritized.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-8 and 30-31 are not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of Lucas and further in view of White. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

B. Claims 9-10

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claim 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst, Lucas, and White and further in view of O'Scolai (U.S. Patent No. 7,050,409). As explained above, claim 7, from which claims 9 and 10 depend, is not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of Lucas and further in view of White. Furthermore, O'Scolai does not make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst, Lucas, and White discussed above. Rather, O'Scolai merely discloses a frame and signaling controller system for synchronization between the transmitter and receiver.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 10 are not obvious over van Bokhorst, Lucas, and White and further in view of O'Scolai. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

II. Claims 12-13 and 32

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 12-13 and 32.

A. Claim 32

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst in view of White. As explained above, van Bokhorst teaches a wireless data communication system in which mobile stations are operable in either an awake state or a doze state. Unlike the claimed invention, the mobile station is only in an awake state in which the transceiver of the mobile station is fully powered or in a doze state in which the transceiver of the mobile station cannot receive or transmit messages. Van Bokhorst does not teach a state in which only a portion of the transceiver is powered.

Conversely, claim 32 requires that "prior to receiving a synchronizing signal, a receiver portion of a transceiver enter[s] an active mode." Separately and subsequently, "a transmitter portion of the transceiver enter[s] the active mode." Power consumption is further reduced by energizing only the receiver portion of the transceiver prior to the receipt of a synchronization signal and then subsequently energizing the transmitter portion. This is an advantage over systems known to those in the art.

White does not make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst discussed above. Rather, White merely teaches a communication protocol in which message packets are prioritized.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of White. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of this claim.

B. Claims 12-13

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claim 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst and White and further in view of O'Scolai. As explained above, claim 32, from which claims 12 and 13 depend, is not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of White. Furthermore, O'Scolai does not make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst and White discussed above. Rather, O'Scolai merely discloses a frame and signaling controller system for synchronization between the transmitter and receiver.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-13 are not obvious over van Bokhorst and White and further in view of O'Scolai. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

III. Claims 16-25 and 33

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 16-25 and 33.

A. Claims 16-19, 21, 24, and 33

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 16-19, 21, 24, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst in view of White. As explained above, van Bokhorst teaches a wireless data communication system in which mobile stations are operable in either an awake state or a doze state. Unlike the claimed invention, the mobile station is only in an awake state in which the transceiver of the mobile station is fully powered or in a doze state in which the transceiver of the mobile station cannot receive or transmit messages. Van Bokhorst does not teach a state in which only a portion of the transceiver is powered.

Conversely, claim 33 requires that "energy consumption of a receiver of the second device is increased for a period of time before, during and immediately after each synchronization signal" and "energy consumption of a receiver of the third device is increased for a period of time before, during and immediately after each synchronization signal." Separately and subsequently, "energy consumption of transmitters of each of the second and third devices is increased." Power consumption is further reduced by energizing only the receivers prior to the receipt of a synchronization signal and then subsequently energizing the transmitters. This is an advantage over systems known to those in the art.

White does not make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst discussed above. Rather, White merely teaches a communication protocol in which message packets are prioritized.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-19, 21, 24, and 33 are not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of White. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

B. Claims 20 and 22-23

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claims 20 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst and White and further in view of O'Scolai. As explained above, claim 33, from which claims 20 and 22-23 depend, is not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of White. Furthermore, O'Scolai does not make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst and White discussed above. Rather, O'Scolai merely discloses a frame and signaling controller system for synchronization between the transmitter and receiver.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claims 20 and 22-23 are not obvious over van Bokhorst and White and further in view of O'Scolai. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

C. Claim 25

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Bokhorst and White and further in view of Lucas. As explained above, claim 33, from which claim 25 depends, is not obvious over van Bokhorst in view of White. Furthermore, Lucas does not make up for the deficiencies of van Bokhorst and White discussed above. Rather, Lucas merely teaches a wireless transceiver that performs frequency offset correction.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is not obvious over van Bokhorst and White and further in view Lucas. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests allowance of this claim.

IV. Closing Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the application. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution hereof, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, such as a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 4, 2009

By ___ s /amy l. hammer/_____
Paul M. Vargo; Reg. No. 29,116
Amy L. Hammer; Reg. No. 61,048
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1500
Fax: (312) 655-1501